



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS—ORDINANCES—SCATTERING PAPER—DISCRIMINATION.—CITY OF PHILADELPHIA *v.* BROBENDER, 51 Atl. 374 (Pa.) The municipal council of Philadelphia passed an ordinance prohibiting the casting of advertisements or hand bills not enclosed in envelopes and addressed (newspapers are excepted) into the vestibules, yards or on the porches of dwellings. *Held*, this is a proper exercise of the police power and does not discriminate against a class.

There is no class discrimination, unless those engaged in the same business are affected differently, *Soon Hing v. Crowley*, 113 U. S. 703. It was decided that a city ordinance might cover a private nuisance where it was incidental to a public nuisance even if it were not a common nuisance *per se*.

NEW TRIAL—PERSONAL INJURIES—CONDUCT OF PLAINTIFF.—MCGLOIN *v.* METROPOLITAN ST. RY., 75 N. Y. Supp. 593.—On the first day of a trial for personal injuries, after adjournment and in the presence of jurors, plaintiff became prostrated in the court room, was attended by physicians and after about twenty minutes removed from the room. There was evidence that his physical condition at the trial was the result of the injuries alleged. It was not alleged that the attack was simulated or purposely manifested before the jury, and in response to inquiry by the court, the jurors intimated that the occurrence would not affect their decision. *Held*, that the court's refusal to grant a new trial would not be disturbed.

Two judges dissent on the ground that what had occurred must inevitably have influenced the jury, and that it was practically testimony as to his alleged injuries the truth of which the defendant had no opportunity to question and therefore there was no fair trial in this respect. Their position would have been correct if there had been the least evidence of intentional misconduct by the plaintiff. 12 Enc. Pl. & Pr. 615.

REMOVAL OF CAUSES—SUFFICIENCY OF PETITION—FOREIGN CORPORATIONS.—THOMPSON *v.* SOUTHERN R. R., 41 S. E. 9 (N. C.).—Defendant tried to have the case removed from the State to the Federal court, alleging that it was a citizen of another State than that in which suit was brought and in which plaintiff lived. *Held*, that this allegation was insufficient as it did not state specifically that defendant was not a resident of the State in which suit was brought.

The reason for this decision was that the corporation might be a citizen both of a foreign State and of that in which suit was brought. The rule seems to be that all jurisdictional facts must be stated in the clearest possible manner. *Hirschl v. Machine Co.*, 42 Fed. 803; *Fife v. Whittell*, 102 Fed. 537. It has been held in other cases, however, that a mere allegation that the corporation is a citizen of another State is sufficient, as this precludes the idea of it being a citizen of the State where suit is brought. *Myers v. Murray*, 42 Fed. 695; *Shattuck v. Insurance Co.*, 7 C. C. A. 386.

STREET RAILWAYS—ELECTRIC—ADDITIONAL BURDEN TO ABUTTING PROPERTY OWNERS.—PECK ET AL. *v.* SCHENECTADY R. R. Co., 63 N. E. 357 (N. Y.).—*Held*, that the use of a city street by an electric road is an additional burden to the owners of the fee, for which they are entitled to compensation. Parker, C. J., and Werner, J., dissenting.